



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M-F

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/073,929

02/14/2002

Toshiki Kawasome

6304.620

5326

7590

08/11/2006

Joseph W. Berenato, III  
Liniak, Berenato, Longacre & White, LLC  
Ste. 240  
6550 Rock Spring Drive  
Bethesda, MD 20817

EXAMINER

SHANKAR, VIJAY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/073,929

Applicant(s)

KAWASOME, TOSHIKI

Examiner

VIJAY SHANKAR

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed on 5-26-06.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-17,20-25 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,18,19,26 and 27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Drawings***

2. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because there are Japanese words in Figures 1-9; therefore a new and clean copy of all Figures 1-9 should be submitted. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 5-17, 20-25, 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al (5,300,927) in view of Buxton et al (5,798,752) .

Regarding Claims 1,16,24, Arai et al teaches an input system comprising: a first input device (element 4 as Digitizer in fig.15) for specifying a position on a display screen, which is connected to a computer for executing an application program and for displaying a processing object area of the application program on the display screen, the first input device configured for being controlled by a user's dominant hand (Figs.1,15-16; Column 7, line 26-59; Column 2, line 22- Col.3, line 34); a second input device (element 54 as mouse in fig.15) differing from the first input device, the second input device configured for being controlled by a user's non-dominant hand (Figs.1,15-16; Column 7, line 26-59; Column 2, line 22- Col.3, line 66); an instruction set for instructing a change in a display state of the processing object area on the display screen while the application program is being executed by the first input device, in response to an operation of the second input device; wherein the instruction set includes an emulator generating an instruction signal compatible with the application program executed by the computer, and wherein the instruction signal is responsive to an operation of the second input device (Figs.1,15-16; Column 7, line 26-59; Column 2, line 22- Col.4, line 65). However, Arai et al does not teach the first input device and second input device are simultaneously operable.

Buxton et al teaches a user interface for where the first input device (27) and second input device (30) are simultaneously operable (Figure 1; Column 4, line 44- Col.6, line 22; Col.7, line 47- Col.9, line 35).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Buxton et al into Arai et al for providing the user access to the first input device and second input device same time so the user can use the first input device and second input device simultaneously thus the user can utilized both hands.

Regarding Claims 2,17,25, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein the instruction set instructs a change of a relative position of the processing object area with respect to the display screen in response to an operation of the second input device . (Figs.1,15-16; Column 7, line 26-59; Column 2, line 22- Col.3, line 65).

Regarding Claims 5,20,28, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein the instruction set instructs an editing process for the processing object area displayed on the display screen in response to an operation of the second input device. (Figs.1,15-16; Column 2, line 22- Col.4, line 65).

Regarding Claims 6,21,29, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein the instruction set generates an instruction signal compatible with the application program

executed by the computer, wherein the instruction signal corresponds to an operation of the second input device. ( Column 2, line 22- Col.4, line 65).

Regarding Claim 7, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein the first input device is selected from the group consisting of a mouse, a trackball, a touch pad and a pen tablet (Figs. 1, 15-16).

Regarding Claim 8, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein the second input device differs from the first input device and the second input device is selected from the group consisting of a scroll wheel, a trackball, a touch pad, a key switch and a combination input device. (Figs.1,15-16).

Regarding Claim 9, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein the combination input device comprises a wheel operation section, a ball operation section, and a key switch operation section containing a plurality of key switches thereon. (Figs. 1,15-16).

Regarding Claim 10, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein the second input device is selected from the group consisting of a scroll wheel, a trackball, a touch pad, a key switch and a combination input device. (Figs.15-16).

Regarding Claim 11, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein the combination input device comprises a wheel operation section, a ball operation section, and a key switch operation section containing a plurality of key switches thereon. (Figs.15-16).

Regarding Claim 12, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein a third input device (72 in fig.15), differing from the first and second input devices, is connected to the computer. (Figs.15-16).

Regarding Claim 13, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein the third input device is a keyboard (72 in Fig.15).

Regarding Claim 14, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein a fourth input device, differing from the first, second and third input devices, is connected to the computer. (Figs.15-16).

Regarding Claim 15, Arai et al teaches the input system wherein the fourth input device is a keyboard. (72 in fig.15).

Regarding Claim 22, Arai et al teaches the recording medium having stored thereon a program. (Figs.1,15-16).

Regarding Claim 23, Arai et al teaches the computer storage device, comprising: a storage medium with programs and data associated with the programs stored thereon, the programs and data readable by a central processing unit in a computer; and a recording medium for recording programs and data onto the storage medium. (Figs.1,15-16; Column 7, line 26-59; Column 2, line 22- Col.4, line 65). However, Arai et al does not teach the first input device and second input device are simultaneously operable.

Buxton et al teaches a user interface for where the first input device (27) and second input device (30) are simultaneously operable (Figure 1; Column 4, line 44- Col.6, line 22; Col.7, line 47- Col.9, line 35).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Buxton et al into Arai et al for providing the user access to the first input device and second input device same time so the user can use the first input device and second input device simultaneously thus the user can utilized both hands.

Regarding Claim 30, Arai et al teaches a computer system, comprising: a computer (Figs.1,15-16); a display screen connected to the computer, wherein a



processing object area of an application program usable by the computer is displayed on the display screen (Figs.1,15-16);

a first input device (element 4 as Digitizer in fig.15) connected to the computer, the first input device for specifying a position on the display screen (Figs.1,15-16;

Column 2, line 22- Col.4, line 65);

a second input device (element 54 as mouse in fig.15) connected to the computer, the second input device differing from the first input device (Figs.1,15-16; Column 2, line 22- Col.4, line 65);

an instruction set for instructing a change in a display state of the processing object area of the application program on the display screen in response to an operation of the second input device while the application is being executed by the first input device; (Figs.1,15-16; Column 7, line 26-59; Column 2, line 22- Col.4, line 65) and wherein the instruction set includes an emulator generating an instruction signal compatible with the application program executed by the computer, and wherein the instruction signal is responsive to an operation of the second input device. (Figs.1,15-16; Column 7, line 26-59; Column 2, line 22- Col.4, line 65). However, Arai et al does not teach the first input device and second input device are simultaneously operable.

Buxton et al teaches a user interface for where the first input device (27) and second input device (30) are simultaneously operable (Figure 1; Column 4, line 44- Col.6, line 22; Col.7, line 47- Col.9, line 35).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Buxton et al into Arai et al for providing the user access to the first input device and second input device same time so the user can use the first input device and second input device simultaneously thus the user can utilized both hands.

5. Claims 3-4, 18-19, 26-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior arts fails to teach the input system wherein the instruction set instructs a change of a display magnification ratio of the processing object area displayed on the display screen in response to an operation of the second input device as claimed in Claims 3,18,26.

The prior arts fails to teach the input system wherein the instruction set instructs a change of a display size of an object contained within the processing object area displayed on the display screen in response to an operation of the second input device as claimed in Claims 4,19,27.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIJAY SHANKAR whose telephone number is (571) 272-7682. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BIPIN SHALWALA can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vijay Shankar', with a stylized, cursive script.

VIJAY SHANKAR  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2673

VS